CITY OF SAN JOSE
CAPITAL OF SILICON VALLEY

Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
STEPHEN M. HAASE, AICP, DIRECTOR

INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT FILE NO.: PDC 03-031

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Planned Development Rezoning from RM – Residence District to A (PD) Planned Development to allow the construction of up to (4) four single-family detached and (2) two single-family attached residences and subsequent subdivision on approximately 0.46 acres.

PROJECT LOCATION: North side of Vera Lane, approximately 200 feet westerly of Roeder Road

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: Medium High Density Residential (12-25 DU/AC) **ZONING:** RM – Residence District

SURROUNDING LAND USES: Single-family detached residential to the north and east, and multi-family attached residential uses to the south and west.

PROJECT APPLICANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS: Kawadri Trust, Attn: Mazen Kawadri, 3461 Loes Way, San Jose, CA 95127

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial study:

☐	I find the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
X	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the project proponent has agreed to revise the project to avoid any significant effect. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
☐	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT(EIR) is required.
☐	I find the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, but at least one effect has been (1) adequately analyzed in a previous document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) addressed by mitigation measures based on the previous analysis as described in the attached initial study. An EIR is required that analyzes only the effects that were not adequately addressed in a previous document.
☐	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, no further environmental analysis is required because all potentially significant effects have been (1) adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are included in the project, and further analysis is not required.

December 18, 2003
Date

Signature
Phone No.: (408) 277-4576

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock out-croppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2
e) Increase the amount of shade in public and private open space on adjacent sites?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2

FINDINGS: The proposed project is located on a currently undeveloped site within an urban area that has no scenic resources and is surrounded by detached and attached residential uses and roadway. Implementation of the proposed project will not introduce substantial new sources of light or glare to the project area. The site will be landscaped as part of the project once construction is complete. The project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the project:					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,3,4
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,3,4
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,3,4

FINDINGS: The subject property is not designated by the California Resources Agency as Farmland of any type, is not zoned for agriculture use, and is not subject to a Willaimson Act Contract. There is no property used for agricultural purposes adjacent to the project site.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required

III. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,14
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,14
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is classified as non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,14
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	X	☐	☐	1,14
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,14

FINDINGS: Construction of the proposed project could result in short-term air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter generation.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*

MITIGATION MEASURES: The BAAQMD has prepared a list of feasible construction dust control measures that are expected to reduce construction impacts to less-than-significant levels. The following mitigation will be implemented during all phases of construction on the project site:

1) Water all active construction areas at least twice daily or as often as need to control dust emissions.
2) Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials and/or ensure that all trucks hauling such materials maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
3) Pave, apply water twice daily or as often as necessary to control dust, or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas and construction areas.
4) Sweep daily or as often as necessary with water sweepers all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites to control dust.
5) Sweep public streets daily or as often as needed to keep streets free of visible soil material.
6) Hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
7) Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles
8) Limit vehicle traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.
9) Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

Implementation of the proposed mitigation will reduce construction related air quality impacts to a less than significant level.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,10
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any aquatic, wetland, or riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,6,10
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc., through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,6
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,10
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,11
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐		X	1,2

FINDINGS: The project site is relatively flat and supports non-native vegetation, which ranges in height from 6 inches to several feet. Weedy grasses dominate the vegetation. The project site is bordered by Vera Lane to the west and

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*

south, and residential uses to the north and east. The subject site does not support natural or sensitive habitats that would support endangered, threatened, or special status wildlife species.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,7
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,8
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	☐	X	☐	☐	1,8
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	X	☐	☐	1,8

FINDINGS: The project site is not located in an area of known archaeological sensitivity. Staff concludes the proposed development will not have a direct or indirect impact on cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as described on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	☐	☐	X	☐	1,5,24
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,5,24
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,5,24
4) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,5,24
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	X	☐	☐	1,5,24
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,5,24
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,5,24
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,5,24

FINDINGS: The project site is located within the seismically active San Francisco region. While the site is not located on or near an earthquake fault, severe ground shaking is probable during the useful life of the proposed buildings. The site located in a generally flat area, with relatively little potential for erosion, and no possibility of landslide. No waterways are immediately adjacent to the site. Geologic conditions on the

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*

project site will require that the proposed buildings be designed and built in conformance with the requirements of the Uniform Building Code.

Mitigation Measures: None required.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	X	1
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X	1
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	X	1
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,12
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	X	1
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	X	1

FINDINGS: The project does not propose the use or storage of hazardous materials. No known hazardous materials contaimination exists on the project site.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,15
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	X	1
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site?	☐	X	☐	☐	1
d) Result in increased erosion in its watershed?	☐	☐	X	☐	1

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-or off-site?	☐	X	☐	☐	1
f) Substantially alter drainage patterns due to changes in runoff volumes and flow rates?	☐		X	☐	
g) Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff as specified in the NPDES permit and the City's Post Construction Urban Runoff Management Policy?	☐	X	☐	☐	
h) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐		X	☐	1,17
i) Result in an increase in pollutant discharges to receiving waters such as heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash?	☐	X	☐	☐	1,17
j) Result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303 (d) list available from the State Water Resources Control Board?	☐	☐	X	☐	
k) Result in alteration of receiving water quality during or following construction including clarity, temperature, and level of pollutants?	☐	X	☐	☐	
l) Substantially alter surface water quality, or marine, fresh, or wetland waters as specified in the NPDES permit?	☐	☐	X	☐	
m) Substantially alter ground water quality as specified in the NPDES permit?	☐	X	☐	☐	
n) Cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses as specified in the NPDES Permit, General Plan, and City policy?	☐	X	☐	☐	
o) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	X	☐	1
p) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,9
q) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,9
r) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	X	1
s) Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	X	1

FINDINGS: Construction and operation of the project will result in the same types of stormwater runoff pollutants as the existing adjacent urban uses. Runoff often carries grease, oil, and trace amounts of heavy metals into natural drainages. Runoff from landscaping can carry pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers. Although the amounts of these pollutants ultimately discharge into the waterways are unknown, over time they could be substantial. Implementation of the proposed project could result in increased stormwater pollution during construction. The project will not deplete the groundwater supply or significantly increase stormwater runoff. The following mitigation measures are included in the project to reduce the potential construction-related water quality impacts.

MITIGATION MEASURES: The following measures based on Regional Water Quality Control Board Best Management Practices, are included in the project to reduce potential construction related water quality impacts:

1) Burlap bags filled with drain rock will be installed around storm drains during construction to route sediment and other debris from the drains.

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*

2) All exposed or disturbed soil surfaces would be watered at least twice daily or as often as necessary to control dust.

3) Stockpiles of soil or other materials that can be blown by the wind would be watered or covered.

4) All trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials would be covered and all trucks would be required to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.

5) All paved access roads, parking areas, staging areas and residential streets adjacent to the construction sites would be swept daily with water sweepers.

6) Vegetation in disturbed areas would be replanted as quickly as possible.

7) Storm Water Permit administered by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Prior to construction grading for the proposed land uses, the applicant will file a Notice of Intent to comply with the General Permit and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan which addresses measures that would be included in the project to minimize and control construction and post-construction runoff. The following measures would be included in the SWPPP:

   A) Preclude non-stormwater discharge to the stormwater system.

   B) Effective, site specific Best Management Practices for erosion and sediment control during the construction and post-construction periods.

   C) Cover soil, equipment, and supplies that could contribute non-visible pollution prior to rainfall events or perform monitoring of runoff.

   D) Perform monitoring of discharge to the storm water system.

8) The project will submit a copy of the draft SWPPP to the City of San Jose for review and approval prior to construction of the project site. The certified SWPPP will be posted at the project site and will be update to reflect current site conditions.

9) When the construction phase is complete, a Notice of Termination for the General Permit for Construction will be filed with the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the City of San Jose. The Notice of Termination will document that all elements of the SWPPP have been executed, construction materials and waste have been properly disposed of, and a post-construction stormwater management plan is in place as described in the SWPPP for the site.

10) As part of the mitigation for post-construction runoff impacts addressed in the SWPPP, the project will stencil catch basins to discourage illegal dumping.

With implementation of the mitigation measures listed above, the project will result in less than significant impacts on stormwater quality.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2

FINDINGS: The applicant is proposing the construction of up to (4) four single-family detached and (2) two single-family attached residential units, consistent with the City of San Jose 2020 General Plan. The proposed land use is compatible with other lands uses adjacent to the project site. The project would not divide an established community and the site is not covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan or a Natural Community Conservation Plan.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required

X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2,23
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2,23

FINDINGS: The proposed project site is within a developed urban area and it does not contain any known or designated mineral resources.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required

XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,2,13,18
b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	X	☐	1
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	X	1
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	X	☐	☐	1
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X	1
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X	1

FINDINGS: Construction activity would require the use of heavy equipment during grading that would temporarily increase noise levels within the project area. Noise generating activities associated with grading and construction of the project site would temporarily elevate noise levels in the area surrounding the project site.

MITIGATION MEASURES: The following measures have been included to reduce potential construction related noise impacts.

1.) Construction will be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday for any on-site or off-site work within 500 feet of any residential unit. Construction outside of these hours may be approved through a development permit based on a site-specific construction noise mitigation plan and a finding by the Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement that the construction noise mitigation plan is adequate to prevent noise disturbance of affected residential uses.

Implementation of the proposed mitigation would reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X	1
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X	1

FINDINGS: The proposed single family detached residential buildings will be constructed on a vacant property. The project will not displace housing and will not substantially induce growth in this area.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES - Would the project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
Fire Protection?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2
Police Protection?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2
Other Public Facilities?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2

FINDINGS: The project site is located in an urbanized area of San Jose. The project site is served by existing utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, solid waste/recycling, and natural gas/electric facilities. The site is served by existing fire stations. No additional Fire or Police personnel or equipment would be necessary to serve the project.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required

XIV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,2
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2

FINDINGS: The project proposes the construction of up to (4) four single-family detached and (2) two single-family attached residential units. As proposed, all units will have a rear yard/private open space. In addition, as part of the development process the project developer will be paying standard Parkland Dedication fees for improvements towards park facilities in the neighborhood.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required

XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC - Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio of roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,2,19

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,2,19
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐		X	1,19
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible land uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,19
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,20
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,18
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,2,18

FINDINGS: The proposed project has been reviewed by the City of San Jose, Department of Public Works who have concluded that the proposed project will not result in any significant impacts and is in conformance with the City of San Jose Transportation Level of Service Policy.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,15
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,2,21
c) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,17
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,22
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,21
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,21
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	X	1,21

FINDINGS: The water lines servicing the site have adequate capacity to support the proposed project. The City's existing storm drainage system will serve the new development. The stormwater runoff at this location will not exceed the capacity of the local drainage system, and will not contribute significantly to downstream flooding. Development of the proposed project will not result in significant increase in solid waste and recyclable materials within the City of San Jose.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None required

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Issues	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*	*Information Sources*
a) Does the project have the potential to (1) degrade the quality of the environment, (2) substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, (3) cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, (4) threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, (5) reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or (6) eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	X	☐	1,10
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects and the effects of other current projects.	☐	☐	X	☐	1,16
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	X	☐	1

FINDINGS: The proposed project would contribute incrementally to traffic, air quality, and noise impacts associated with development in an urban area. Project impacts on the natural and human environment would be less than significant, and mitigation measures have been included in the project to reduce any potential impacts to less than significant level. No significant cumulative impacts would result with implementation of the proposed project.

MITIGATION MEASURES: None Required.

CHECKLIST REFERENCES

1. Environmental Clearance Application – File No. PDC 03-031
2. San Jose 2020 General Plan
3. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Soil Survey of SC County, August 1968
4. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Important Farmlands of SC County map, June 1979
5. State of California's Geo-Hazard maps / Alquist Priolo Fault maps
6. Riparian Corridor Policy Study 1994
7. San Jose Historic Resources Inventory
8. City of San Jose Archeological Sensitivity Maps
9. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, Santa Clara County, 1986
10. California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, 2001
11. City of San Jose Heritage Tree Survey Report
12. California Environmental Protection Agency Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, 1998
13. City of San Jose Noise Exposure Map for the 2020 General Plan
14. BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, Bay Area Air Quality Management District. April 1996, revised 1999.
15. San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board 1995 Basin Plan
16. Final Environmental Impact Report, City of San Jose, SJ 2020 General Plan
17. Santa Clara Valley Water District
18. City of San Jose Title 20 Zoning Ordinance
19. San Jose Department of Public Works
20. San Jose Fire Department
21. San Jose Environmental Services Department
22. San Jose Water Company, Great Oaks Water Company
23. California Division of Mines and Geology
24. Cooper Clark, San Jose Geotechnical Information Maps, July 1974